

REPLY TO ROOSEVELT



Being the Speech of

EX-GOVERNOR JOHN P. ALTGELD

of Illinois, delivered before the
Ohio Association of Democratic
Clubs at Toledo, August 1, 1900.

There are only two principles or systems of the governed. The one is applied from by brute force and government by consent of government known to man—government without and is repressive, and, in the end, destructive, because it arrests growth; while the other works from within, is evolutionary and progressive.

Government by force has existed for thousands of years, and its tendency is everywhere the same. It has checked growth, arrested development, cowed the nobler aspirations of man, stunted the intellect, and covered the earth with suffering and misery. The constant tendency of such a government is toward a lower and a lower level, and repressive measures become more and more severe until finally conditions are created which result in dissolution and death.

Government by Consent of Governed.

Government by consent of the governed stimulates the higher aspirations of man. In the atmosphere of freedom the intellect develops and becomes active in all the fields of human effort. Under this system of government the people reach their highest capabilities, not in one line but in all lines. They reach the highest standard of manhood and womanhood, the highest ideals of justice and human felicity; and the nations of the earth have been great in proportion as they recognized the principle of freedom.

Those people and nations that recognized only the principle of brute force have passed away without leaving so much as a name on the pages of history. Those people whose careers history has deemed

worthy of notice and who have helped man forward on the road of progress and enlightenment, especially the Greeks, the Romans and medieval cities, recognized in part the principle of freedom, and only that part of their population reached a high development to which this principle was permitted to apply.

Formation of Our Republic.

The principle of governing by consent of the governed was first applied in its broadest sense in the formation of our Republic, and it worked a revolution in human society. It has given the world more progress in one century than it achieved in the 50 or 60 centuries of recorded time. By freeing the intellect, by encouraging the higher aspirations man leaped into an activity in all lines of human effort that had been impossible in the past, there was a new birth in inventions, in the industries, in agriculture, in art, in literature, in government, and in education. To this we are largely indebted for our shops, our railroads, our cities, our agriculture and everything that makes us great.

Moving along the lines of peace and progress, along the lines of evolution and development, it is mastering matter, it is annihilating space, it is uniting man with his brother, it is bringing the human race to its God. All of the nations of the earth have been affected by the principles of our Declaration of Independence.

Greatest World Power on Earth.

Not only has this given us the marvelous development of the American continent, but it has made us the most potential nation on the globe. For a third of a century our nation has been the greatest world power on earth; not through its armies, or its navies, or its display of material splendor, or its brute force; but through its high ideals, through its high standards of justice, it commanded the respect, the confidence and the admiration of mankind, and has drawn after it all of the peoples of the earth.

Army Officer and Constitution.

We have seen the spectacle of a Major General of the United States Army, who was sworn to defend the Constitution and was paid a salary by the government for that purpose, stand up in his gorgeous uniform and tell an assembly of wine drink-

ing trust magnates that the Constitution was no longer binding.

Now after a career of unparalleled splendor, after having been the hope of the human race for a century, after having shaped the civilization of the age, it is solemnly proposed to abandon the principles that made us great, to come down from the heights where we have been beckoning the nations, and to get on the low plane of brute force, and enter into a scramble with the despotic nations of the earth in an attempt to plunder weaker people. For one hundred and twenty-five years we have celebrated the wisdom and heroism of the fathers in resisting King George and in establishing the eternal principle of human equality. Now we are forced to witness the spectacle of a Republican administration enacting into a law and placing upon the statute books the exact principles contended for by King George, and the defenders of this Administration sneeringly tell us that the Declaration of Independence is a mere tissue of silly generalities.

Incredible as it may seem, at the close of this marvelous century, which is the child of the Declaration of Independence, we are asked to go back to those principles which have cursed the world for thousands of years, and which, if again given sway, will bring back the "dark ages." You ask who are the people and whence comes the influences that make this astounding proposition. They are the people who represent greed, rapacity and corruption. They are the same class of people and they are the same influences that have arrested human progress and human development in all lands and in all periods where they had sway. The fates have decreed that greed should be short sighted and should hold the penny of immediate advantage so close to its eye as to shut out the sun.

It is a noticeable fact, verified by all human experience, that in no case does a policy that is dictated solely by greed prove successful in the end. On the contrary it always destroys the very interest it was intended to serve and build up.

The successive steps toward destruction are always concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, universal corruption, subversion of the basic principles of government, oligarchical control, steady lowering of the conditions of the masses, degradation, debauchery, dissolution and death.

Work of Republican Party.

For forty years the Republican party has controlled the policies of this Government, while during that time the Democrats twice elected a President, yet during one term they did not have control of Congress, and during the other nothing was done that changed the policy of the Government. I wish to speak kindly of the Republican party; it came into the world with a great mission, and when guided by Lincoln it stood for justice, equality and humanity; but with the wiping out of slavery its mission was performed and it passed into the hands of corruptionists until it stands for exactly the opposite principles of those that were represented by the martyr President.

Since the civil war every method of plunder that genius of man could invent has been practiced: government has been used to enrich the few.

Through the special privileges obtained from the government great combinations and syndicates known as "trusts" have been formed, which are to-day devouring the substance of the American people which control every great industry, all the means of transportation, control the money of the country, have destroyed the small, independent men of the land; have destroyed the hopes of the young men of the land; have made an independent and honorable career for a poor man impossible. Our people inhabit the richest continent on this globe, with the most salubrious climate. They were recognized to be, upon the whole, the most intelligent, industrious, frugal, enterprising and progressive people in the world: surely they needed only to be let alone in order to be happy. Not only would they be comfortable and prosperous, but they would make the rest of the world happy; and yet, without war or famine or pestilence, this marvelous people, occupying this wonderful land, has been twice brought to absolute ruin, degradation and misery by the Republican policy, and is now approaching a third period of disaster. In 1873, with a Republican President and a Republican Congress and Republican policy in full force, the whole country broke down. Nearly one-half of our people were utterly ruined and the degradation and distress was indescribable. After years of misery and suffering, we started anew. We went on under Republican laws and Republican policy until in the spring of '92, before

the newly elected Democratic President could be sworn in, before any law was changed, or any policy arrested, the country again broke down and was covered with misery. Nearly one-half of our people were again ruined, and no pen can describe the wretchedness and distress that followed.

People Started Anew.

After several years of suffering and misery this wonderful American people, with their great country, their fine climate, their marvelous capacity and industry, started anew. There were some accidents in mining that helped us. There were great droughts and calamities that befell other nations which temporarily helped us. There was a war with Spain which temporarily helped us. Conditions were created which enabled the managers of trusts and speculators of the country to accumulate great wealth. But no genuine prosperity can be based upon accident nor the calamity of others. Already we see signs of distress, already the conditions indicate that we are again moving toward another industrial and commercial collapse.

Years ago our factories ran day and night, and our home market consumed all their products; not five per cent of our business was with foreign nations. This home market has been destroyed by depriving our people of their ability to buy. If the purchasing power of our people could be restored to what it was at the close of the civil war, then, with our increased population, we could consume at home every thing that our mills and our factories can make. We are not suffering from over-production; we are suffering from under-consumption. This destruction of the purchasing power of our people has been brought about by the Republican policies which make the foreigner's money dear and American farm products cheap. Whenever a mill shuts down, whenever there is paralysis in industry and stagnation in business, whenever property values in this country sink, then we reap the harvest of the legislation which England, by the aid of Republican politicians, has fastened on our country.

Cause of Ruin.

My Republican friend, have you been ruined without any fault of your own by a panic? Has your independence as a man.

your ability to do business and support your family been destroyed? Has the future of your sons and of your daughters been made doubtful, if not hopeless? Then bear in mind that these conditions have been brought upon our land by men with soiled hands who own, control and manipulate the Republican party and the Republican President.

Bear in mind that every trust in America is fighting the Democratic platform. Even the alleged Democratic stockholders on the Republican ice trust of New York, controlled by Tom Platt's son, are fighting our platform. Why? If they thought we would not overthrow the trusts they would not fight us. Trusts do not fight for nothing. We have declared that private monopoly is indefeasible and shall not exist in America. They know that men who are in earnest will find a way to make the will of the people effective. The trusts know their friends. Even a casual glance shows you that there is this difference between the two great parties as regards trusts. The trusts constitute the head, the shoulders, the spine, the limbs and the soul of the Republican party of to-day. They own, control and direct it. They have erased every great motto from its banners and have substituted a vulgar dollar mark. The men who to-day speak for the Republican party as a rule are mere trust creatures, who have to change their song every moon in defense of their masters and secret employers.

Democracy After Trusts.

On the other hand, the trusts are only a speck on the tail of the Democratic party, and it is doing its best to lash them off. In order to perpetuate their power the trusts are now raising millions of dollars to help Mark Hanna debauch the American elections. Will you help them or will you stand for your own independence and the independence and happiness of your children?

Republican politicians have made America a tribute-paying colony to Great Britain; American valor and American patriotism had triumphed over the English on every open field; we had defeated their armies, we had destroyed their fleets. But, aided by corrupt Republican politicians, England was able to dictate the policies of our government, to shape all of our financial legislation, until to-day she is supreme mistress of this country, and her

statesmen openly boast, in Parliament and out of Parliament, that they have an understanding with the American government which is of a higher order than written treaties.

After the civil war England got our government to retire its paper money and issue interest-bearing bonds. It thus reduced the amount of paper money in our country one-half and prices of American products fell one-half, and debtors were ruined, and we had the panic of '73. Then England got our government to lead the way in reducing the volume of the world's metallic money by one-half, and again the prices of American products fell one-half, debtors were ruined and we had the panic of '93. Then England got the present friendly administration to pass a law providing that in the future everything in this country shall be payable in gold, which will still further reduce the price of American products.

Consequence of Legislation.

The consequence of all this legislation is that to-day, after we have paid off more than half of the debt of the war, it will take more of American products, more of American sweat and labor, to pay what is left of that war debt than it would have taken at the conclusion of the war to have paid it all. While to-day, when an Englishman gets one of our thousand-dollar bonds, whether a government bond or a railroad bond or a farm mortgage, he finds that the interest which we must pay him on that bond will buy twice as much of American products as the interest on the same bond would buy for him twenty odd years ago.

See how we rush to the assistance of England in the case of China.

A year ago the newspapers and the men that spoke for the administration talked of the early partition of China. England has already taken a harbor—Germany had taken a harbor and Russia had taken a harbor. We were told that we must keep the Philippines because they constituted a near-by tree behind which we could hide until the hold-up took place, when we could quickly rush out and get our share of the plunder. Now that the trouble in China has unexpectedly arisen, England has her hands full in Africa. She is not in a position to demand the lion's share of the spoils; therefore she does not want a partition to take place at present, and instantly the McKinley administration issues an

edict that China must not be partitioned. Whether the edict was right or not is immaterial. It was issued to protect English interests. It is time this toadyism should end. It is time we had an American administration at Washington.

Democrats Save Cuba.

In the spring of 1898 the Democratic party, assisted by a few patriotic Republicans, forced the administration, against its will, to go to the rescue of outraged and suffering Cuba. You recall the fact that the administration and those powerful influences that control it were opposed to this step. They were on the side of the men who held Spanish bonds and who would make money out of human suffering. But they were forced to yield to the sentiment of the American people, and history will give to the Democracy the credit of driving an ancient despotism off of the western hemisphere.

At the beginning of April, 1898, Congress declared war against Spain in behalf of Cuba, and further declared that Cuba was and of right ought to be free and independent, that we were not going to assert American sovereignty, but that just as soon as order was restored in the island we would leave the government of the island to the people thereof. We disdained the thought of conquest; we disdained the thought of land grabbing; we went out on a mission of humanity; we were true to our traditions, and we won the encomiums of the civilized world. Even the President declared that forcible annexation would be criminal aggression. But no sooner had war been declared than the interests which opposed it turned around and determined to make all out of it that was possible, and we had an era of embalmed contracts, embalmed beef, embalmed ships and embalmed striplings for officers to command the American forces. The war in Cuba scarcely rose to the dignity of a skirmish. It lasted but a few months; it has been over nearly two years. Yet we are still engaging in war. Those influences of greed and rapacity which were at first opposed to Cuban war have embarked the administration upon a policy of conquest, a policy of imperialism and a policy of militarism.

War in Philippines.

Long before we declared war against Spain in behalf of Cuba the people of the Philippine Islands had been waging

war for their own independence. They continued this warfare and finally drove the Spaniards off of the islands. And we are now engaged in a war to rob the islanders of their independence and make the people subjects, not citizens, of this republic.

There is to-day no question of expansion before the American people, and all the talk about expansion is simply an effort to conceal the facts and to mislead the public. The sole question is whether we shall go into the colonial business with England and the despotic nations of Europe. Let me say here that the Democratic party has been the party of expansion. It gave to our republic the country west of the Mississippi and Florida, Texas, New Mexico and California. The Democratic party believes that, moving along the line of natural growth and development and without violating the principles of freedom, the time will come when by constitutional methods Canada on the north and the West India Islands on the south will rap for admission to this Republic. It believes that the time will come when, from the frozen skies of the north to the warm waters of the south, there will be one people, one flag, one civilization, one great brotherhood of man. But no such question is now before us.

What do the defenders of the administration say?

Speech Without an Argument.

Recently a gentleman in New York who had become famous for having been alone in Cuba—a gentleman who has adopted as his life motto or coat of arms two "P's" and a double "S," which four letters signify "pompous posing" and "strenuous strutting"—left the capital of New York and went to St. Paul and delivered a speech to an association of Republican clubs. The speech has not, from beginning to end, a single argument or a single accurate historical reference; a speech that is made up of invective, misrepresentations and vituperation.

Ordinarily the speech would not be noticed even in a country newspaper, but inasmuch as it was made by a man whom Tom Platt has permitted to be Governor of New York, as it was made by a man whom the trusts of America have selected to preside over the Senate of the United States in order that their interests may be

secured, inasmuch as it was made by a man who is a candidate for the suffrages of the American people, inasmuch as it was made by a man who is relied on to secure the perpetuation of the regime of hypocrisy and revolution in the White House, who is relied on to help make the grasp and control of British influence over our people still more complete, I will notice this speech to see the kind of misrepresentations that the Republican party feels compelled to resort to.

Referring to the Democrats, he said: "They stand for lawlessness and disorder, for dishonesty and dishonor, for license and disaster at home, and cowardly shrinking from duty abroad."

This is a reflection on the intelligence and patriotism and the honor of every Democrat in the country. It is a personal insult to the six and one-half million of men who supported Mr. Bryan in 1896, and to the eleven millions of freemen who are going to support him in 1900.

The question arises: Is this the language of a sincere and discreet man, and therefore worthy of notice, or is it simply the hysterical rant of a political mountebank, and therefore to be treated with contempt?

He gives no facts and advances no arguments in support of this charge. It is simply an assertion. He puts himself in evidence. Aside from truthfulness, it involves his sincerity and discretion.

Incidents of a Public Career.

Who, then, is this man, and what is his history? Personalities are offensive and I will not indulge in them. But, surely, when we are thus brutally assaulted we may ask who it is that is berating us.

I will notice only a few of the incidents of his public career, which throw light on the question of his sincerity and discretion. I find it recorded that years ago he was a member of the New York Legislature, and on one occasion he roused the hopes of the country by making a speech against a class which he called the criminal rich. But he at once dashed these hopes by turning around and voting with and for these very criminal rich whom he had denounced.

In the years 1897-8 he held a Federal office in Washington, and in order to escape paying his taxes in New York he signed an affidavit and swore before the ever-living God that he was not a citizen of

New York. If this was true, then, under the constitution of New York, he would not have been eligible for the Governor of that state. By subsequently accepting a nomination and election to that office he showed that he did not believe his own affidavit. This being so, may it not be that he does not believe the charge that he has made against us?

Killed a Spaniard.

It is next recorded that he entered the Spanish war in Cuba, and, although his regiment was commanded by another man, he succeeded by means of that modern weapon of warfare known as a newspaper bureau in winning more renown in a week than General Grant did in four years of hard fighting, and he seems to be the only man on this continent who boasts of having with his own hand shot down and killed a Spaniard that was fleeing from the battlefield. In his book he says: "As they turned to run I closed in and fired twice, missing the first and killing the second." He then boasts that he had considered this feat unique, and so it is. He is the first brave man to shoot an enemy in the back.

Again, the modern historians tell us that it was he who first demonstrated to mankind that however useful the camera may be to science, to art and to industry, its true mission is to develop tinplate heroes.

The records at Albany show that the Governor got the Legislature to pass a law taxing the franchises of corporations—a most righteous law. But the records also show that at the demands of Tom Platt and the corporations he reconvened the Legislature in extra session and had it change this law as the corporations dictated.

The canal fund of New York had been robbed of about \$9,000,000 by Republican politicians, and, although he talked loudly of prosecution, the Governor has not brought one of these men to justice.

History records the fact that the Governor has never lost an opportunity, when standing in the temple or the market place, to make loud protestations of heroic virtue, but the historian has searched in vain for any evidence of performance. The volume of profession is full, but the page of performance is a blank.

Vulgar Assaults Ignored.

I wish to avoid even the appearance of severity, and, as I have not the language to properly characterize this man's career,

I shall not attempt it. He is the right man to defend criminal aggression and the abandonment of plain duty by the President. He is the right man to defend a war of conquest, the burning of towns, the slaughter of people, and the assassination of liberty. But the Democratic party will pay no attention to his vulgar assaults.

Let us read again from his speech:

"After infinite labor they finally did decide at Kansas City that they still believed in free silver. This decision was reached in their committee by a vote of 26 to 24, so that it appears they only have 52 per cent of faith in their 48 cent dollar after all."

Had the Governor stuck to the truth as a candidate for so dignified an office as the Vice-Presidency should do, he would have told his audience that there were two sets of delegates at the Kansas City convention. One set wanted simply to reaffirm the Chicago platform, claiming that inasmuch as that platform contained as strong and clear a plank on the financial question as could be framed, a reaffirmation was all that was necessary.

The other set of delegates insisted on having a special reiteration of the financial plank, and they prevailed. Had they failed and the Chicago platform simply been reaffirmed, the principles for which the party stands would have been the same. It was not a difference of principle between the delegates, but simply a difference of opinion as to the most effective way of stating that principle to the country. The Governor certainly knew this.

Now, when a Democrat stoops to misrepresentation he is called a pettifogger and a demagogue, but I suppose that when the Republican candidate for the Vice Presidency stoops to do this it will be called strenuous life.

Defense of President's Policy.

Now hear his defense of the President's policy. I read from his speech:

"When, through Jefferson, the great West beyond the Mississippi was acquired, when largely through the instrumentality of Jackson Florida was added to the Union, the new provinces, with their Indian populations, were governed precisely and exactly on the theory under which the Philippines are now governed. President Jefferson secured the Louisiana purchase just as President McKinley secured the Philippines, and Andrew Jackson warred against the Semi-

noles, when we had acquired Florida from Spain, just as General MacArthur is now warring against the brigands among the Tagals in Luzon; unless we are willing to deprive Jefferson and Jackson of the meed of honor which has been held to be particularly theirs, we can not deny the same high praise to President McKinley."

Now, what are the historical facts? When we acquired Louisiana and when we acquired Florida, not only did the treaties provide that the new territory should be an integral part of our Republic, and that the inhabitants of the new territory should be citizens of our Republic, to which they did not object, but the territory in each case was at once made a part of the Republic and the inhabitants at once became citizens of the Republic. And the same is true in the case of Texas, in the case of New Mexico and in the case of California. It was in harmony with the Declaration of Independence, it was extending its blessings to more people; it was giving the benefit of free institutions to more of the inhabitants of the earth. It was expansion, it was growth, it was development, it was statesmanship. We were true to our high mission in each of these cases. But in negotiating the treaty with Spain, the Administration carefully omitted from the treaty the provision that the new territory should become an integral part of our Republic, and that the inhabitants of the territory should become citizens of the Republic.

Hanna on Hand.

When this treaty came up for ratification in the Senate of the United States on February 6, 1899, the Administration forces, led by Mark Hanna, got the Senate to adopt a resolution declaring that the Philippine Islands should not become an integral part of this Republic, and that the inhabitants of said islands should not become citizens of this Republic. On the same day Senator Bacon introduced a resolution in the Senate which provided that whenever the people of the Philippine Islands should establish a stable government, which, in the opinion of our Government, was worthy of recognition, that then we would withdraw from the islands on such terms as might be just, and leave the people of the islands to govern themselves.

You will notice that this resolution proposed to keep matters in our hands; it proposed that when they should establish a government which, in our judgment, was a good one that then we would give them

their independence. Let me ask you if the Philippine people should establish a government which in our judgment was a good government, are they not entitled to their independence just as much as we are entitled to ours? Yet, reasonable as this resolution seemed, the Administration forces, led by Mark Hanna, marshaled all their strength against this resolution and had it defeated. Consequently, on that day the Administration served notice on the Philippine people that their country could not be a part of this Republic; that they could not become citizens of this Republic; that they could not have the benefit of the Declaration of Independence; that they could not have the blessings of the free institutions under which we lived, and it further served notice on them that, no matter how good a government they might establish, no matter what their capability, that they never could have their independence, never could have their freedom, that they had simply changed masters. That formerly they had Spanish rulers, Spanish judges and Spanish tax collectors; now they must submit to having American rulers, American judges and American tax collectors, and, I will add, American tax-eaters.

Philippine Policy.

You see, my friends, the policy which the Administration adopted toward the Philippines is exactly the opposite of that adopted by Jefferson, by Jackson, and by later Democratic Administrations in acquiring new territory.

It is not a question of expansion at all. It is solely and simply a question of imperialism and militarism. They are to be subject colonies. We are going to govern them with carpet-baggers. Will the politicians who rob our home cities be better when sent to the Philippines? We hear much said about our humane and philanthropic design in governing those islands, our high purposes; but, my friends, basic principles always shape ultimate results. Government by brute force is the same in all ages and in all countries, and produces the same harvest. We need not theorize about this—we have had experience. It has not been long since we covered the Southern states with carpet-bag government, and it took that country a whole generation to recover from the stealing, pillaging and the universal rottenness that was established there.

We have a later example of this philanthropic and humane policy. Not long ago the Administration appointed a man to manage the finances of Cuba. It selected an Ohio politician, whose principal recommendation for the place was that he had helped Mark Hanna steal a Senatorship. He went to Cuba and rose to the highest expectation. He managed things so well that there was nothing left for anybody else to manage. The Governor, speaking of Cuba, says: "General Wood's administration is a synonym for honesty and cleanliness."

Carpet-baggers in Cuba.

- Some of you have read the Republican papers. You have read the accounts of how our military officers there are being paid two salaries, wrung from these poor people. The fact is, my friends, that when the Governor uttered these words the ink was not yet dry on the Republican papers that gave an account of the frauds and pilferings of our carpet-baggers in Cuba. One paper lapsed into poetry, and it relieved its soul in this wise:

"Around Cuba's table the carpet-bagger sits;
He grabs all he's able, he keeps all he gits."

Let me ask you, why does the candidate for Vice President make such a deliberate misrepresentation of historical facts? Why tell the American people that the Administration is pursuing the same policy pursued by Jefferson and Jackson? Manifestly, it is because he feels that the facts must be kept from the public. The Republicans resort to deliberate misrepresentation because they feel that it is the only way in which they can keep themselves in power.

Let us look at the attitude of the Administration before the treaty was ratified. The documents, the letters, the dispatches on file in the departments at Washington give us complete information on all points. These dispatches and papers show that after Dewey had sunk the Spanish fleet at Manila the Administration thought of having him come away. Then it considered the idea of keeping one island as a base for our shipping, and it asked Dewey's opinion as to which was the best. He recommended Luzon. Then the British Minister waited on the President and urged him to keep all of the islands and to go into the colonial business with England.

England's Love for Us.

You recall that the administration papers told us in big headlines that England loved

us so much she wanted us to keep all the islands. It has since developed that Germany wanted to buy the islands of Spain. England did not want Germany for a neighbor in the South seas. She could not control German statesmen as she could American politicians. She could not dictate German policy as she could American policy; therefore, if she could not have the islands herself, the next best thing was to have them held by an administration which she could control; hence the desire that we should keep them.

Instantly the syndicates of America and the forces of greed, rapacity and corruption united in favor of that policy. It meant new contracts, it meant commissions in the army for the sons of the rich, it meant opportunities to make fortunes out of the government, it meant opportunities for bonding, and for despoiling weaker nations.

Dewey Heard From.

Meantime Dewey furnished Aguinaldo arms, and on June 27, 1898, wrote to the department at Washington as follows: "I have given Aguinaldo to understand that I consider the insurgents as friends, being opposed to the common enemy. He has gone to attend a meeting of insurgent leaders for the purpose of forming a civil government. His progress has been wonderful. I have allowed him to pass recruits, arms and ammunition and to take such Spanish arms and ammunition from the arsenal as he needed. I have advised him frequently to conduct the war humanely, which he has done invariably." Here the government at Washington was advised that Admiral Dewey was treating Aguinaldo and the other insurgents as allies engaged in a war against a common enemy, and was further advised that Aguinaldo and his associates were establishing a civil government. Mind you, not an American government, but a Philippine government. This government was modeled after our Constitution. It had an executive, legislative and judicial department. On July 4, 1898, General Anderson, who then commanded our land forces at Manila, wrote to Aguinaldo as follows:

"Dear General—I desire to have the most amicable relations with you and have you and your people co-operate with us in the military operations against the Spanish forces."

Here was a recognition from the General

in command of the American forces to Aguinaldo and his government, treating them as allies and asking for their co-operation.

Philippine Army.

During the summer and fall of 1898 Aguinaldo's government applied repeatedly to President McKinley for an expression as to the policy that he intended to pursue toward the Philippines, asking whether the Philippine people were to be treated like the Cubans. This was all they wanted. They were already co-operating with us against Spain. They had hailed us as friends and they simply wanted a declaration as to our intentions. But the President, having already secretly embarked upon a policy of imperialism, evaded an answer. He gave them lofty platitudes about the blessings of civilization and about our benevolent purpose, but this was all. Had he told them they were to be treated like the Cubans, not a man would have been killed in the Philippines. In the meantime, the Philippine army, which numbered about thirty thousand men altogether, made itself master of the whole of the Philippine Islands, excepting Manila, which was held by us. Remember, it was the Philippine army and not the American army that did the fighting on the Philippine Islands. They whipped the Spaniards and took them prisoners; they made the escape of the Spanish army from Manila even impossible; they captured all of the cities of the archipelago excepting Manila. We have now the indisputable evidence of men who were on the ground, who traveled over the country and saw the conditions with their own eyes, that the Philippine government up to the time it was destroyed by our forces maintained law and order and performed all the functions that could be expected of a new government.

Treaty of Peace With Spain.

The treaty of peace with Spain was signed on Dec. 12, 1898. At that time the Americans held Manila, with a territory of about fifteen miles square, and the Philippine government and the Philippine army were in possession of all the remainder of the Philippine Islands with the exception of Iloilo, which was captured a week later. With the capture of this city, the last vestige of Spanish authority was gone in the islands. The Philippine government and the Philippine army were su-

preme, save alone in Manila. What did we get by our treaty? Suppose Spain had been in actual possession of all of the islands, she could not sell the inhabitants against their will. A government cannot sell its people; it cannot sell human souls. It can only sell property and agree not to interfere in certain territory. So that Spain could not have sold us those people if she had been in possession. At the time of making the treaty she had nothing to sell. The inhabitants of the islands, to whom the country belonged, were in possession and were in control, and her deed to us was not worth recording. But the treaty did not go in force until it was ratified by both the Senate of the United States and the Spanish Cortes. It was not ratified by the Senate until Feb. 6, 1899. It was not in effect until that day.

Military Government.

But the President did not and does not rely on this treaty, for on Dec. 21, 1898, nearly six weeks before the treaty was ratified and before we could get any rights under the treaty, and while the Philippine government and Philippine army were in possession of the Philippine Islands, excepting Manila, the President issued his order to General Otis, who then commanded our forces, to extend the military government of Manila over the whole of the Philippine Islands, to compel the Philippine people to recognize American sovereignty. This is the heart of the matter. This caused the war. Why did the President demand recognition of American sovereignty before the treaty was ratified? He told the people that they must accept our authority or be destroyed; that they had simply changed masters; that formerly they had Spanish masters, now they had American masters. This demand for American sovereignty was the cause of this war. It was an order of conquest. We had no rights in the islands at that time because the treaty was not ratified. It was not simply a command to keep the peace and keep order.

In order to carry out this command it was necessary to destroy the Philippine government and the Philippine army, which was a vigorous one and had defeated the Spaniards. General Otis saw this. He tried to soften the matter by issuing an order of his own in which he attempted to mellow down the President's orders, but he did not succeed. He was forced to attempt to carry out the command of the

President. This marked the beginning of the new war. It is not even pretended that this was necessary to preserve order. You can preserve order without asserting sovereignty. This war was not ordered by Congress as the Constitution requires, but is a war that was begun solely by the order of the President, acting under the influence of the British Ambassador and American syndicates.

Every few weeks we are told that the islands are pacified; that American sovereignty has finally been established, at the point of the bayonet, and yet we have an army of seventy thousand men there, and lately when the commanding General was asked to send some of his men to China, he replied that one regiment was all that he could spare.

Atrocities in the Islands.

For two years the American Republic, through President McKinley, has been burning villages, shooting down men, women and children, who had done us no harm, who, according to all the evidence, were peaceable and industrious people, who are guilty of no crime, except that they had read the Declaration of American Independence, had admired the heroism of the fathers of this Republic, had believed in the honor of our country when we declared that in going to war with Spain it was not for purposes of conquest; and who had dared to aspire themselves to that freedom and independence for which our forefathers died.

Let me again read from Governor Roosevelt's speech. Speaking of the Philippines, he says: "To give independence now would be like giving independence to the wildest tribe of Apaches in Arizona." In another part of his speech, in speaking of Cuba, he says: "Our pledge to Cuba shall, of course, be kept." That is, we are going to keep our word and we are going to give Cuba her independence. Now, let us see whether the governor's description of the Philippines is correct or whether it is a base libel upon an innocent people. If it is correct, then when Admiral Dewey furnished arms and ammunition to Aguinaldo and his associates he was arming savages and was doing an act that is condemned by all civilized nations; an act that is considered infamous. And when he co-operated with them as allies against Spain he was co-operating with savages, an act which would be a blot never to be wiped out.

Guilty of a Crime.

If the governor's description is correct, then when General Anderson, in command of our land forces, wrote to Aguinaldo and asked his friendly co-operation against the common enemy he made an ally of savages and was guilty of a crime for which the civilized world will not forgive him. If the governor is not correct, then we are murdering and plundering our allies. Evidently Admiral Dewey believed in the intelligence and in the patriotism and in the high character of Aguinaldo and his followers or he would have had nothing to do with them. And evidently he believed in their ability to form a civil government that could be co-operated with because he took the trouble to advise the department at Washington that Aguinaldo and his associates had gone to establish such a government.

He further testified to the high character of Aguinaldo and his associates by declaring that while the Spanish did not always conduct the war along humane lines, Aguinaldo and his followers did. Evidently General Anderson had confidence in the intelligence, patriotism and character of Aguinaldo and his followers, or he would not have made them allies; and he had confidence in the government they were setting up, or he would not have asked their co-operation. But we are not left to surmise as to the character of the Philippine people. In the fall of 1898, the Peace Commission, sitting at Paris, asked Admiral Dewey for his opinion of the Philippine people and he replied as follows: "In a telegram to the Department on June 23 I expressed the opinion that these people are far 'superior in their intelligence and are more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races.' Further intercourse has confirmed me in this opinion."

General King's Views.

Now, remember, my friends, that the principal Philippine people with whom the Admiral had come in contact were Aguinaldo and his followers. Let me give you the testimony of another army officer. He did not view these people from the distance of ten thousand miles, but he was on the ground. General Charles King of the United States army on June 22, 1899, wrote to the editor of the Milwaukee Journal as follows: "The capability of the

Philippines for self-government cannot be doubted. Such men as Arellano, Aguinaldo and many others whom I might name, are highly educated. Nine-tenths of the people read and write. All are skilled artisans in one way or another. They are industrious, frugal, temperate, and given a fair start could look out for themselves infinitely better than our people imagine." Admiral Dewey sent two members of his staff, named Sargent and Wilcox, to make an inspection of the country. They spent several months in the island and traveled nearly 500 miles inland. Their report has been made a part of the Congressional Records of Jan. 9, 1900, and gives us a splendid idea of the character and institutions of the Philippine people. They found villages, towns and cities. They found the people just as General King has described them—peaceable, industrious, intelligent, law-abiding and hospitable. They found evidence of cultivation and refinement in the most inland town.

Visit to Malolos.

Even Mr. Barrett, who has represented the government in the Orient, who has been over the Philippines and who, for some reason best known to himself, is endeavoring to apologize for the course of the Administration, described the Philippine legislature. In the fall of '98 he visited Malolos, the Philippine capital, where the Philippine congress was in session, and he says that, "The hundred men who composed it would compare favorably in behavior, manner, dress and education with the average men of the better class of other Asiatic nations, including the Japanese. These men, whose sessions I repeatedly attended, conducted themselves with great decorum, and showed a knowledge of debate and parliamentary law that would compare favorably with the Japanese parliament.

"The executive portion of the government was made up of a ministry of bright men who seemed to understand their respective positions. Each general division was subdivided with reference to the practical work. There was a large force of under secretaries and clerks who appeared to be kept busy with routine labor." Again speaking of the Philippine government, Mr. Barrett, in January, 1899, said: "This government has practically been administering the affairs of the great island since

the occupation of Manila, and is certainly better than the former administration."

Aguinaldo's Army Described.

Mr. Barrett also described Aguinaldo's army in this language: "The army, however, of Aguinaldo was the marvel of his achievements. He had over twenty regiments of comparatively well organized, well drilled and well dressed soldiers, carrying modern rifles and ammunition. I saw many of these regiments executing not only regimental, but battalion and company drill with a precision that astonished me. They were officered largely with young men who were ambitious to win honors and were not merely show fighters. The people in all the different towns took a great pride in this army. Nearly every family had a father, son or cousin in it. Wherever they went they aroused enthusiasm for the Philippine cause. Aguinaldo and his principal lieutenants also made frequent visits to the principal towns and were received with the same earnestness that we show in greeting a successful President."

General Miller of the United States army paid the same tribute to the efficiency of the native government, as he found it at Iloilo. And United States Consul Wildman, speaking of this government said, "Aguinaldo has made life and property safe, preserved order, and encouraged a continuation of agricultural and industrial pursuits. He has made brigandage and looting impossible; respected private property, forbidden excess, and made a woman's honor safer in Luzon than it has been in three hundred years."

Commander Forte's Language.

Commander Forte, of the United States Asiatic squadron, used this language: "The Filipinos described in sentimental papers are not the men we are fighting. The fellows we deal with out there are not ignorant savages fighting with bows and arrows; but are intelligent, liberty-loving people, full of courage and determination. The idea that the Filipino is an uncivilized being is a mistaken one. They have the intellect and stamina of governing themselves, and have done it for three hundred years, although under the rule of Spain. They were the clerks, the bookkeepers, the assessors, and managed the entire machinery of government. While they fight for entire freedom, all they ask is a chance

for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

What General Whittier Said.

General Charles A. Whittier, who was on General Merritt's staff in the Philippines, and who went there with the idea that the Filipinos were savages, writes as follows about them: "But after a little while, with my changed estimate of the Filipino character, seeing their order, industry, frugality, temperance, tolerance of danger and fatigue, and when I reviewed their struggle for independence, the brutality inflicted upon them for years by the Spaniards, their dignity and skill, it seemed to me our duty to use them and our credit and resources in making a great country, as I believe it could have been made. I felt, and still feel sure, that with a little tact and diplomacy the people would have accepted our protectorate. My idea being to intrust them with the administration of all the local offices, to admit them to subordinate places in our army, by which in a short time a force of five thousand men would have been adequate, and after a short trial I should have been glad, in proper time, to have turned over the whole country to them. Such a course would have involved no loss of life or of money."

General Whittier spoke warmly in behalf of the Philippine people and of Aguinaldo before the Paris Peace Commission; and afterward, in referring to this matter, he said: "I think that the qualities shown by Aguinaldo and his people fully justify all that I said before the commission. I don't think there was a necessity for the loss of a single life in battle at Manila since the first day of May, 1898. I grieve every day over the new recitals of this wicked fighting and its attendant results."

Trust Candidate.

Now look at the spectacle of a trust candidate for Vice-President of the United States, who has never seen the Philippines, standing up at a distance of 10,000 miles from these islands and, in order to get votes in support of a criminal cause, is willing to libel those innocent people, who have done neither him nor us any harm, but whose towns we have been burning for nearly two years, whose fathers and brothers we have been shooting down, whose fields we have been laying waste, on the order of President McKinley issued

December 21, 1898, beginning a war of conquest.

Danger of Militarism.

I again read from the Governor's speech as follows: "Of all idle chatter, the talk of danger of militarism is the idlest." Let us see. Heretofore our regular or standing army has generally consisted of from 22,000 to 25,000 men. But in December, 1898, about the time that the President issued his order to General Otis to begin the war of conquest, when the Spanish war was over, when we were at peace with the world, when nobody was threatening us, when all that the Philippine people asked of us was that we should treat them the same as the Cubans, the President sent a message to Congress asking to have the regular army increased to 100,000 men. What for? If we were in danger, why not call for volunteers? Volunteers fought the Revolutionary war and founded this republic; volunteers drove the English off of our shores in 1812; volunteers planted the Stars and Stripes all over Mexico; volunteers fought the greatest war for liberty ever waged, struck down slavery and cemented this union; and in 1898 volunteers came to the front and struck down the last vestige of ancient despotism on this hemisphere.

The glory of our republic has been written with the valor and blood of our volunteers. They founded it and they have defended it and made it great. Yet now, in time of peace, a Republican President asks, not for volunteers, but for regular soldiers. Why? Because we are departing from the ways of the fathers; we are going into rivalry with the despotic nations of Europe in governing people by brute force, and we must have the same kind of machinery that our rivals have used in that business.

Kind of Soldiers Needed.

Governor Lind of Minnesota some time ago explained why for this new business we must have regulars and not volunteers. He said the volunteer carries a conscience as well as a gun. That kind of a soldier is invincible when fighting for liberty and his country, but is not considered absolutely reliable when it comes to doing dastardly work. For this purpose we must have regular soldiers. The despoticisms of Europe do not have volunteers; they have regular armies, and if we are going to imitate them then we must have regular armies; and if we are to be their rivals, we

must have a large military establishment as they have.

And if in time of peace, with no trouble even threatening, you can jump a military establishment from 22,000 to 100,000 men all at once, will it not be easy then to jump to 200,000 and 300,000, and will it take us long, do you think, until we have a military establishment equal to that of Germany or Russia? Government by brute force means militarism. It cannot be maintained without it. And the colonial policy means militarism. It cannot be maintained without it. This whole system means the sapping of the vitality of the country. It means false standards of patriotism, false standards of honor. It means a feverish display of barbaric splendor for a brief period. It means the degradation and impoverishment of the masses of the people. It means the death of free institutions. It is not a new question. It is as old as government. It has been tried repeatedly and repeatedly, and all history has but one voice on this question. The historian, Froude, has summed up the experience of the world in the following language:

"If there be one lesson which history clearly teaches it is this, that free nations cannot govern subject provinces. If they are unable or unwilling to admit their dependencies to share their own constitution the constitution itself will fall in pieces from mere incompetence for its duties."

New Departure.

And what are we to gain by this new departure? We are told that we will extend our trade. Think of subverting our institutions and blighting the hopes of the human race for the sake of extending trade! But it will not extend our trade. We are to maintain what they call the "open door" in the Philippines. All nations can trade on the same basis. If we get any trade there we will have to compete for it. The fact that we are expending millions to maintain a military system and subverting our own institutions will not help us get trade. Besides, the Philippine people are poor people; they work for a few cents a day; their needs are few; they cannot buy goods made by American high-priced labor. They cannot buy our wheat, nor our cotton, nor our factory goods. But their cheap labor can be utilized by the syndicates of America for the purpose of thrusting aside the American laborer and taking the bread away from his children.

Old Policy of Repression.

Again, this policy has this material defect, even for the purpose of extending trade, and that is, it rests on brute force. It is the old policy of repression, which, by cowering the intellect and repressing the noble aspirations of man, arrests development, and in the end produces decay and death. In the end, produces the destruction of trade. Whereas the principle of freedom acts as a perennial stimulant on the mind of man and stimulates the activities in every field of human effort, and thus constantly enlarges trade and commercial enterprise.

Lincoln's Immortal Words.

Listen to the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln:

"What constitutes the bulwarks of our liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements or bristling sea-coasts, our army or our navy. Our reliance is in the love of liberty, which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands, everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seed of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the strength of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you.

"They who deny freedom to others, deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God cannot long retain it."

Now, my friends, we propose to stop this criminal aggression into which the syndicate and the British ambassador have launched us. We are going to stop bloodshed and devastation in the Philippines by saying to the Filipinos that when they establish a government which in our judgment is a good government worthy of recognition that then we will withdraw on such terms as may be just.

We are going to do what the President called our "plain duty toward the Porto Ricans." We are going to redeclare that King George was wrong, and that his principles shall not disgrace our statute books.

This is not a partisan question; it is an American question. In 1861 you were not

asked, "Are you a Democrat or a Republican?" You were only asked, "Do you love the flag of your country, and will you fight for it?" To-day you are only asked, "Do you believe in free institutions, and will you help preserve them?"

Are you a son of the Revolution? Then step to the front and help save that for which your ancestors died.

Do you believe Washington was right when he led his men over the icy hills of Valley Forge? Do you believe the fathers were right when they fought at Bunker Hill or fell at Lexington? Do you believe Lincoln was right when he stood on the battlefield of Gettysburg and prayed that government of the people, for the people and by the people might not wither from the face of the earth? Then join the free men of America in one supreme effort to again establish a republican government at Washington--to forever drive Hanna and the syndicates from the temple, and put an end to imperialism, militarism and McKinleyism.



100

